

*[Handwritten signature]*



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
08/899,434	07/24/97	JOHNSON	J 10172-9013

IM31/0922  
KANE, DALSIMER, SULLIVAN, KURUCZ,  
LEVY, EISELE AND RICHARD, LLP  
711 THIRD AVE  
NEW YORK NY 10017

EXAMINER	
GRAY, L	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER

1734

DATE MAILED: 09/22/00

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

**Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks**

**Advisory Action**Application No.  
**08/899,434**Applicant(s)  
**Johnson**Examiner  
**Linda L. Gray**Group Art Unit  
**1734****THE PERIOD FOR RESPONSE: [check only a) or b)]**

- a) ☒ expires six months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☐ expires either three months from the mailing date of the final rejection, or on the mailing date of this Advisory Action, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for the response expire later than six months from the date of the final rejection.

Any extension of time must be obtained by filing a petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a), the proposed response and the appropriate fee. The date on which the response, the petition, and the fee have been filed is the date of the response and also the date for the purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. Any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.17 will be calculated from the date of the originally set shortened statutory period for response or as set forth in b) above.

- ☒ Appellant's Brief is due two months from the date of the Notice of Appeal filed on 9-7-00 (or within any period for response set forth above, whichever is later). See 37 CFR 1.191(d) and 37 CFR 1.192(a).

Applicant's response to the final rejection, filed on 9-7-00 has been considered with the following effect, but is NOT deemed to place the application in condition for allowance:

- ☒ The proposed amendment(s):
- ☒ will be entered upon filing of a Notice of Appeal and an Appeal Brief.
- ☐ will not be entered because:
- ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search. (See note below).
  - ☐ they raise the issue of new matter. (See note below).
  - ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal.
  - ☐ they present additional claims without cancelling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE:

- ☒ Applicant's response has overcome the following rejection(s):  
claims 1-3 and 8-15 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph

- ☐ Newly proposed or amended claims \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment cancelling the non-allowable claims.
- ☒ The affidavit, exhibit or request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  
see "Attachment to Advisory Action"
- ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
- ☒ For purposes of Appeal, the status of the claims is as follows (see attached written explanation, if any):  
Claims allowed: 9-11 and 13-15  
Claims objected to: \_\_\_\_\_  
Claims rejected: 1-3, 8, and 12

- ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ ☐ has ☐ has not been approved by the Examiner.

- ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_

- ☒ Other *Review of 60/Q35,051 demonstrates support for the vacuum belt means (claims 9-11 and 13-14), the tape cutter assembly (claim 12), and the ultrasonic sealer (claim 8). The declaration filed 3-27-00 has been entered. No declaration objections remain.*

*Linda L. Gray*  
LINDA L. GRAY  
PATENT EXAMINER  
ART UNIT 1734


**Attachment to Advisory Action**

Applicant argues that tensioning is not-obvious as it relates to a tape for precise location and sealing since the sealing mechanism needs to be precisely and consistently located relative to a predetermined section of the tape.

In response, there appears to be no significant relationship between the tensioner and the sealing mechanism because the sealing mechanism applies a pieces of tape which has been cut from a tensioned web (using the tensioner) of the tape and after the pieces have been transported from the cutter to the sealing mechanism.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications should be directed to Examiner Linda L. Gray at (703)308-1093, Monday-Friday from 6:30 am to 3:30 pm. The necessary fax numbers are (703)305-7718 (official), (703)305-7115 (unofficial), and (703)305-3599 (after final).

llg   
September 20, 2000

  
**Linda L. Gray**  
**Primary Examiner**